Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 18 1999
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 98-1506

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1998

DONALD D. BARRY, ESQ., et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

McSHARES, INC., d/b/a RESEARCH PRODUCTS,

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The Supreme Court Of The State Of Kansas

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ARLEN L TANNER #16411
Counsel of Record
NORMAN I. REICHEL #13573
WALLACE, SAUNDERS, AUSTIN,
BROWN & ENOCHS, CHARTERED
10111 West 87th Street,
P.O. Box 12290
Overland Park, Kansas 66282
(913) 888-1000 FAX (913) 888-1065

NORMAN R. KELLY
NORTON, WASSERMAN, JONES & KELLY
215 South Santa Fe, P.O. Box 2388
Salina, Kansas 67402-2388
(785) 827-3646

Counsel for Petitioners
Donald D. Barry and
Anthony S. Barry

March 1999

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

6688

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the Federal Court's exclusive jurisdiction over Federal antitrust actions preempts collateral State attacks on the Federal Courts' decisions, rulings and procedures through subsequent State causes of action for malicious prosecution or abuse of process when, in cases where the Federal Court has exclusive jurisdiction and no pendent claims are present, Federal Rule 11 provides a full, complete and sole remedy for allegations that the Federal antitrust claim lacked probable cause and was allegedly brought with improper purpose especially where, in the antitrust action, the Federal District Court Judge overruled Motions to Dismiss, Motions for Summary Judgment and Motions for Directed Verdict.

LISTING OF PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Parties to the proceeding in the Supreme Court of Kansas were:

Plaintiff/ Appellant:	McShares, Inc., d/b/a Research Products
Defendants/ Appellees:	Donald D. Barry, Esq. and Anthony S. Barry, Esq.; Barrack, Rodos & Bacine, a General Partnership, P.C.; Leonard Barrack, P.C.; Gerald J. Rodos, P.C.; Daniel E. Bacine, P.C.; Anthony J. Bolognese; David H. Weinstein, Esq.; Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C.; Joseph C. Kohn, Esq. and Steven A. Asher, Esq.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTION PRESENTED i

LISTING OF PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING ii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES vi

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI 1

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 1

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES AND RULES INVOLVED IN THIS CASE 2

Rule 11(b) 3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 4

The Underlying Federal Antitrust Action 4

State Malicious Prosecution/Abuse of Process Case 5

State District Court Found Preemption 5

Kansas Supreme Court Reversed 6

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 6

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

I. The Kansas Supreme Court Has Usurped Exclusive Federal Authority by Determining a State Court Can Re-evaluate a Federal Court's Determinations of Probable Cause and Propriety of a Federal Antitrust Case, in a State Malicious Prosecution and Abuse of Process Case Filed Against Certain Attorneys Who Represented Several Antitrust Plaintiffs in a Federal Antitrust Suit that Terminated in a Jury Verdict; in that Federal Courts Enjoy Exclusive Jurisdiction Over Federal Antitrust Cases and Federal Courts Make the Exclusive Determination of Whether a Federal Antitrust Case Is Properly Brought or Maintained and as Federal Rule 11, in Actions Solely Involving Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction, Preempts Any State Attempts to Subsequently Make Determinations of Probable Cause or Improper Purpose in Regards to the Filing or Continuing of a Federal Antitrust Action..... 6

Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction..... 6

Preemption..... 9

Federal Law Controls Determination of Probable Cause..... 11

Rule 11 Preempts Only In Cases of Exclusive Jurisdiction..... 13

Congressional Incentives..... 14

Rule 11 Is Sole Remedy for Areas of Exclusive Jurisdiction..... 16

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

Congress Encourages Private Enforcement..... 21

CONCLUSION 23

APPENDIX

APP. A – KANSAS SUPREME COURT OPINION.....App. 1

APP. B – JUDGMENT ENTRY OF DISTRICT COURT .....App. 27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Andrea Theaters, Inc. v. Theater Confections, Inc., 787 F.2d 59 (2nd Cir. 1986) 7

Anesthesia Advantage, Inc. v. Metz Group, 912 F.2d 397 (10th Cir. 1990)..... 8

Armstrong v. Taco Time International, Inc., 30 Wash. App. 538, 635 P.2d 1114 (1981)..... 8

Bastien v. R. Rowland & Co., 631 F.Supp. 1554 (E.D. Mo. 1986) 18

Blumenstock Bros. Advertising Agency v. Curtis Publishing Co., 252 U.S. 436 (1920).....7, 8

Brown Shoe Co. v. United States, 370 U.S. 294 (1962) 8

Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat, 429 U.S. 477 (1977) 8

Business Guides, Inc. v. Chromatic Comm. Ent., Inc., 498 U.S. 533 (1991) 13, 14, 17

Byram Concretanks, Inc. v. Warren Concrete Products Co. of N.J., 374 F.2d 649 (3rd Cir. 1966) 16

Capital Imaging Ass'n v. Mohawk Valley, 725 F.Supp. 669 (S.D.N.Y. 1989) 11

Castrol, Inc. v. Parm Trading Co. of N.Y.C., Inc., 645 N.Y.S.2d 825, 228 A.D.2d 633 (1996)..... 8

Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Hammond, 726 F.2d 483 (9th Cir. 1984) 11

Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc., 505 U.S. 504 (1992) 9, 10, 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

Cohen v. Lupo, 927 F.2d 363 (8th Cir. 1991) ... 13, 17, 18

East-Bibb Twiggs Neighborhood v. Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Comm'n, 674 F.Supp. 1475 (N.D. Ga. 1987) 20, 21

Edmunds v. Lawrence Nat. Bank & Trust Co., 16 Kan. App.2d 331, 823 P.2d 219 (1991) 17

Elkins v. Showcase, Inc., 237 Kan. 720, 704 P.2d 977 (1985) 11

Fagan v. Sunbeam Lighting Co., Inc., 303 F.Supp. 356 (S.D. Ill. 1969) 11

Fidelity Federal Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. De La Cuesta, 458 U.S. 141 (1982) 9, 10

Florida Lime & Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Paul, 373 U.S. 132 (1963) 11

Furillo v. Dana Corp. Parish Div., 866 F.Supp. 842 (E.D. Pa. 1994) 19, 20

General Inv. Corp. v. Lakeshore Ry., 260 U.S. 261 (1922) 7

Gonzales v. Parks, 830 F.2d 1033 (9th Cir. 1987) ... 17, 18

Great Western Bank v. Southeastern Bank, 507 S.E.2d 191 (Ga. App. 1998) 20

Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U.S. 52 (1941) 11

Idell v. Goodman, 224 Cal App. 3d 262, 273 Cal. Rptr. 605 (1990) 18, 19

In re Kouterick, 167 B.R. 353 (Bcy. D. N.J. 1994) 17

Jewel T Co., Inc. v. Local Unions, 274 F.2d 217 (1960) 8

Jones v. Rath Packing Co., 430 U.S. 519 (1977) 10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

Leh v. General Petroleum Corp., 165 F.Supp. 933 (D.C.S.D. Cal. 1958) 15

Lightning Lube, Inc. v. Witco Corp., 4 F.3d 1153 (3rd Cir. 1993) 13, 17

Mason v. Smith, 672 A.2d 705 (N.H. 1996) 17

McShares v. Barry, 970 P.2d 1005 (Kan. 1998) 1

Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. v. Massachusetts, 471 U.S. 724 (1985) 10

Miller v. Granados, 529 F.2d 393 (5th Cir. 1976) 7

M.S.R. Exploration Ltd. v. Meridian Oil, Inc., 74, 237 F.3d 910 (9th Cir. 1996) 9, 10, 19

Nogales Serv. Ctr. v. Atlantic Richfield Co., 119 Ariz. 552, 582 P.2d 642 (Az. App. 1978) 7

North Carolina Chiropractic Ass'n v. Aetna, 89 N.C. App. 1, 365 S.E.2d 312 (1988) 7

Pennsylvania Automotive Association v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 121 Pa. Cmwlth. 352, 550 A.2d 1041 (1988) 7

Roberto Del Rio v. Anthony Jetton, 55 Cal. App. 3d 430 (1997) 21

Sarno v. Thermen, 608 N.E.2d 11 (Ill. App. 1992) 17

Smith v. Mitchell Constr. Co., Inc., 481 S.E.2d 558 (Ga. App. 1997) 17

Szabo Food Serv. Inc. v. Canteen Corp., 823 F.2d 1073 (7th Cir. 1987) 17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

Twin Cities Sport Serv. v. Charles O. Finley & Co., 676 F.2d 1291 (9th Cir. 1982) 21

Vaughn & Co., Ltd. v. Saul, 143 Ga. App. 74, 237 S.E.2d 622 (1977) 8

CONSTITUTIONAL CLAUSES, STATUTES AND RULES

U.S. CONSTITUTION, Art. I, § 8, cl. 3 ..... 2, 7, 8

U.S. CONSTITUTION, Art. VI, cl. 2 ..... 2, 9

28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) 2

28 U.S.C. § 1337 3

Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 15 ..... 3, 7

Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 4 ..... 2, 7

Fed.R.Civ.P. 11(b) 16

Fed.R.Civ.P. 11(c)(2) 16

Rule 11 ..... *passim*

Rule 11(b) 3

Rule 11(c)(2) 12

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Donald D. Barry, Esq. and Anthony S. Barry, Esq. respectfully pray that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the judgment and opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas entered in this proceeding on December 18, 1998, in order to resolve an important issue of Federal preemption as presented herein.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas that gives rise to this Petition appears at *McShares v. Barry*, 970 P.2d 1005 (Kan. 1998) and is reprinted in Appendix A hereto at page App. 1. The findings and conclusions of the Kansas District Court are set forth in Appendix B at page App. 27.

JURISDICTION

On December 18, 1998, the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas issued an opinion reversing the decision of the Saline County District Court and held that the State Court had jurisdiction and was not preempted from entertaining a State malicious prosecution and abuse of process case against certain attorneys who had represented Plaintiffs in a case where only Federal antitrust issues were involved. The Kansas District Court had determined that it lacked jurisdiction as the State case was preempted by Federal law. (App. 32).

In the Federal antitrust case, the Federal District Court denied Motions to Dismiss, Motions for Summary Judgment and Motions for Directed Verdict and submitted the case to a jury. Although McShares wrote three separate Rule 11 letters in the Federal antitrust action, no Rule 11 motion was ever filed. One letter was copied to the Federal District Court Judge.

The jurisdiction of the Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES AND RULES INVOLVED IN THIS CASE

U.S. Constitution, Art. I, § 8, cl. 3

> The Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes;. . . .

U.S. Constitution, Art. VI, cl. 2

> This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 4

> The several District Courts of the United States are invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain the violations of §§ 1-7 of this title;. . . .

28 U.S.C. § 1337

The District Courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action or proceeding arising under any Act of Congress regulating commerce or protecting trade and commerce against restraints and monopolies: . . .

Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 15

(a) Amount of recovery, prejudgment interest

Except as provided in Subsection (b) of this section, any person who shall be injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover three-fold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorneys' fee. . . .

Rule 11(b)

By presenting to the Court (whether by signing, filing, submitting, or later advocating) a pleading, written motion, or other paper, an attorney or unrepresented party certifying that to the best of the person's knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances –

(1) It is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase of costs of litigation;

(2) The claims, defenses, and other legal contentions therein are warranted by existing law or by nonfrivolous argument for the

extension, modification, or reversal of existing law with the establishment of new law;

(3) The allegations and other factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and. . . .

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Underlying Federal Antitrust Action

In November and December of 1993, seven separate class action complaints, each alleging *only* Federal antitrust violations, were filed by separate plaintiffs against various companies involved in the aluminum phosphide industry. One of the complaints named McShares as an antitrust defendant. Another complaint was later amended to add McShares as an antitrust defendant. The Federal District Court consolidated the individual class action complaints and appointed lead counsel, liaison counsel and a steering committee. Subsequently, a single consolidated class action complaint was filed. An amended consolidated class action complaint was filed approximately nine months later. This amended consolidated class action complaint, like all the previous complaints, alleged only Federal antitrust violations under the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

In the underlying Federal antitrust action, McShares sent three separate Rule 11 letters, even sending a copy of one Rule 11 letter to the Federal District Court Judge, but did not file a Motion for Rule 11 sanctions. McShares also

filed Motions to Dismiss, for Summary Judgment and for Directed Verdict. The Federal District Court denied these Motions. The cause was submitted to a jury. The jury returned a verdict in favor of McShares and the remaining antitrust defendants.

State Malicious Prosecution/Abuse of Process Case

McShares filed the present suit in Kansas State Court against a selected few of the approximately 28 attorneys who had appeared on behalf of the various antitrust Plaintiffs. The McShares' suit alleged malicious prosecution and abuse of process against these attorneys for filing the Federal antitrust Complaint against McShares. The matter was removed to Federal District Court where certain dispositive motions were filed, including one based on Federal preemption. The Federal District Court remanded the matter because all defendants failed to timely consent to removal.

State District Court Found Preemption

The State District Court entered its Order dismissing the matter on the basis that, as Congress had vested exclusive jurisdiction over Federal antitrust actions in the Federal Courts, State Courts were preempted from determining issues, such as probable cause, arising solely out of the Federal antitrust actions, and therefore, Federal Rule 11 was McShares' exclusive remedy, and the subsequent State malicious prosecution and abuse of process actions were preempted. (App. 27-32).

Kansas Supreme Court Reversed

The Supreme Court of Kansas reversed the dismissal and held that Federal Courts' jurisdiction over Federal antitrust actions did not preempt subsequent State actions alleging malicious prosecution or abuse of process. (App. 26). The Kansas Supreme Court held that antitrust law was different from bankruptcy because, "the Constitution grants Congress plenary powers over bankruptcies. . . . " (App. 15).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I. The Kansas Supreme Court Has Usurped Exclusive Federal Authority by Determining a State Court Can Re-evaluate a Federal Court's Determinations of Probable Cause and Propriety of a Federal Antitrust Case, in a State Malicious Prosecution and Abuse of Process Case Filed Against Certain Attorneys Who Represented Several Antitrust Plaintiffs in a Federal Antitrust Suit that Terminated in a Jury Verdict; in that Federal Courts Enjoy Exclusive Jurisdiction Over Federal Antitrust Cases and Federal Courts Make the Exclusive Determination of Whether a Federal Antitrust Case Is Properly Brought or Maintained and as Federal Rule 11, in Actions Solely Involving Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction, Preempts Any State Attempts to Subsequently Make Determinations of Probable Cause or Improper Purpose in Regards to the Filing or Continuing of a Federal Antitrust Action.

Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction

Where Federal Courts have exclusive jurisdiction and determine a Federal antitrust action can be submitted to a

jury, the use of State Courts to attack determinations of probable cause through malicious prosecution suits are preempted, and Rule 11 is the sole remedy for such allegations. Permitting such State attacks on exclusive Federal matters undermines the Federal determinations and supremacy. Claims arising solely under Federal antitrust law fall under the exclusive jurisdiction of Federal Courts and any claim solely based on that Federal antitrust claim must be considered to have arisen under Federal law.

The Constitution of the United States granted Congress the authority to regulate commerce among the several states and with foreign nations. U.S. CONST., Art. I, § 8, cl. 3. The Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 4 and the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 15, confer exclusive jurisdiction on the Federal Courts to prevent and restrain such violations. *Blumenstock Bros. Advertising Agency v. Curtis Publishing Co.*, 252 U.S. 436, 440 (1920).[1] State Courts may not grant affirmative relief based on a claim for which Federal jurisdiction is exclusive. *Andrea Theaters*, 787 F.2d at 62.

---

[1] See also *General Inv. Corp. v. Lakeshore Ry.*, 260 U.S. 261, 287 (1922); *Andrea Theaters, Inc. v. Theater Confections, Inc.*, 787 F.2d 59, 62 (2nd Cir. 1986); *Miller v. Granados*, 529 F.2d 393, 395 (5th Cir. 1976); *North Carolina Chiropractic Ass'n v. Aetna*, 89 N.C. App. 1, 4, 365 S.E.2d 312, 313 (1988); *Pennsylvania Automotive Association v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 121 Pa. Cmwlth. 352, 550 A.2d 1041, 1044 (1988); *Nogales Serv. Ctr. v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*, 119 Ariz. 552, 554, 582 P.2d 642 (Az. App. 1978).

Matters involving Federal antitrust laws, whether raised by way of attack or defense, are beyond the jurisdiction of State Courts. *Armstrong v. Taco Time International, Inc.*, 30 Wash. App. 538, 547, 635 P.2d 1114 (1981); *Castrol, Inc. v. Parm Trading Co. of N.Y.C., Inc.*, 645 N.Y.S.2d 825, 228 A.D.2d 633 (1996); *Vaughn & Co., Ltd. v. Saul*, 143 Ga. App. 74, 85, 237 S.E.2d 622 (1977).

The antitrust laws derive their authority from the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the states. *Blumenstock Bros.*, 252 U.S. at 441; U.S. CONST., Art. I, § 8, cl. 3. These antitrust laws are uniquely Federal in that they pertain to issues of national commerce and are enacted for the protection of competition. *Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat*, 429 U.S. 477, 418 (1977). The essential element for jurisdiction in the Sherman Act is that the challenged activity occurs in the flow of interstate commerce or substantially affects interstate commerce. *Anesthesia Advantage, Inc. v. Metz Group*, 912 F.2d 397, 400 (10th Cir. 1990).

"The antitrust laws were enacted for the protection of competition, not competitors." *Brown Shoe Co. v. United States*, 370 U.S. 294, 320 (1962); *Brunswick*, 429 U.S. at 488. Private suits are merely a vehicle intended to further enforce the antitrust laws for the benefit of the real party in interest, the public. *Jewel T Co., Inc. v. Local Unions*, 274 F.2d 217, 223 (1960).

The Kansas Supreme Court acknowledged that the Sherman Act confers jurisdiction on Federal Courts to prevent and restrain violations of Sections 1 to 7 and that the jurisdiction was exclusive. (App. 15); *Blumenstock*, 252

U.S. at 440. It nevertheless determined that Federal antitrust laws were distinct and different from bankruptcy laws. (App. 15). The Kansas Supreme Court conceded that subsequent State malicious prosecution actions arising out of bankruptcy would be preempted. (App. 15). The Kansas Supreme Court determined that the Federal antitrust laws would not preclude a subsequent State claim based solely on the filing and prosecution of a Federal antitrust action. (App. 23).

Preemption

The Doctrine of Federal Preemption is founded on the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. CONSTITUTION, Article VI, cl. 2. *M.S.R. Exploration Ltd. v. Meridian Oil, Inc.*, 74 F.3d 910, 913 (9th Cir. 1996), citing *Fidelity Federal Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. De La Cuesta*, 458 U.S. 141, 152-53 (1982).

> This Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof . . . shall be the supreme Law of the Land; all the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

U.S. CONST., Art. VI, cl. 2.

Any State law that conflicts with a Federal law is "without effect." *Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc.*, 505 U.S. 504, 516 (1992).

> Once an area of State law has been completely pre-empted, any claim purportedly based on that pre-empted State law is considered, from its inception a Federal claim, and therefore arises under Federal law.

M.S.R. Exploration, 74 F.3d at 912. "[P]re-emption and jurisdiction are to that extent inexorably intertwined." *Id.*

In deciding whether Federal law preempts, the task is to ascertain Congressional intent in enacting the Federal statute at issue. *Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. v. Massachusetts*, 471 U.S. 724, 738 (1985). The purpose of Congress is the ultimate touchstone of preemption analysis. *Cipollone*, 505 U.S. at 516. Congress' intent may be explicitly stated or implicitly contained in the structure and purpose. *Id.*; *Jones v. Rath Packing Co.*, 430 U.S. 519, 525 (1977). Congressional intent may also be revealed through its clear but implicit preemptive purpose. *De La Cuesta*, 458 U.S. 141, 152-53 (1982).

Preemption is compelled when our Congress' command is explicitly stated in the statute's language or implicitly contained in its structure and purpose. *M.S.R. Exploration*, 74 F.3d at 912. Absent explicit preemptive language, Congress' intent to supersede State law altogether may be inferred because "[t]he scheme of Federal regulation may be so pervasive as to make reasonable the inference that Congress left no room for the States to supplement it." *Id.* It may also be inferred because the act of Congress may touch a field in which the Federal interest "is so dominant that the Federal system will be assumed to preclude enforcement of State laws on the same subject." *Id.* When there is a conflict between Federal and State law, where the State law in its application may contravene Federal public policy or cause a different result or consequence, preemption will exist. Preemption occurs if the State law actually conflicts with Federal law or if Federal law so thoroughly occupies a field as to leave the inference that Congress left no room for the

State to supplement it. *Cipollone*, 505 U.S. at 516. In making a preemptive determination a Court should examine those concerns emphasized by Congress in enacting the Federal legislation. *Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Hammond*, 726 F.2d 483 (9th Cir. 1984). Preemption exists where there is a conflict between the Federal and State law, where the State law in its application may contravene Federal public policy or cause a different result or consequence. *Elkins v. Showcase, Inc.*, 237 Kan. 720, 727, 704 P.2d 977 (1985). Preemption exists when State law conflicts with Federal law, that is when compliance with both State and Federal law is impossible. *Florida Lime & Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Paul*, 373 U.S. 132, 142-43 (1963). Preemption also exists when the State law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress. *Hines v. Davidowitz*, 312 U.S. 52, 67 (1941).

Federal Law Controls Determination of Probable Cause

Federal law controls the determination as to whether an antitrust action was properly commenced. *Fagan v. Sunbeam Lighting Co., Inc.*, 303 F. Supp. 356, 358 (S.D. Ill. 1969). A Federal Court can best balance the Congressional intent and can best understand the difficulty an antitrust plaintiff has in investigating prior to filing. "The difficulty of investigating the conspiracy and monopolization claims prior to the initiation of the lawsuits lessens the extent of investigative efforts that an attorney must undertake to satisfy the reasonable inquiry standard." *Capital Imaging Ass'n v. Mohawk Valley*, 725 F.Supp. 669, 681 (S.D.N.Y. 1989).

The determination of whether or not the Federal antitrust case was supported by sufficient probable cause or was not filed for an improper purpose lies exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court. As Congress has granted to the Federal Courts exclusive jurisdiction over Federal antitrust actions, it is for the Federal Courts alone to determine when an action is properly brought. If the Federal antitrust action is brought without sufficient probable cause, it is the District Court Judge who has been assigned the case that must make this determination. Rule 11 stands as the mechanism whereby a Federal Judge can, through sanctions, compensate an antitrust defendant for his damages, including attorneys' fees, in the event that the District Court Judge determines that the Federal antitrust action was filed without sufficient probable cause and for an improper purpose. Rule 11(c)(2).

Where a District Court has considered the basis of the claim in denying motions for dismissal, summary judgment and directed verdict, and has in fact submitted the cause to the jury, it has determined probable cause issues, and permitting a State Court to re-evaluate the probable cause basis of the solely Federal antitrust case would allow the State Court to second-guess the Federal Court's determination within its exclusive province and would permit the State Court to collaterally attack the decisions and determinations of the Federal District Court Judge in an area of exclusive Federal jurisdiction.

Permitting a State "review" of the basis of a Federal antitrust case conflicts with Congressional purposes and could become an obstacle to Congress' intent to encourage civil antitrust claims. For this reason, this Honorable

Court must review this matter to establish that strictly Federal antitrust claims are not subject to State malicious prosecution or abuse of process lawsuits. This Court must issue its Writ of Certiorari to take this case and establish that in areas of exclusive Federal jurisdiction, Rule 11, and the appropriate dispositive motions available in Federal Court, preempt any such subsequent State action for malicious prosecution or abuse of process.

Rule 11 Preempts Only In Cases of Exclusive Jurisdiction

Rule 11 functions as part of preemption of State malicious prosecution or abuse of process claims only in those cases where the sole claim before the Federal Court is one in which the Federal Court enjoys exclusive Federal jurisdiction. This is an important distinction that must be clarified by this Court. In cases where the Federal Court has pendent jurisdiction over a State claim or has before it a claim to which the Court does not enjoy exclusive jurisdiction, Rule 11 preemption of a subsequent State action would not apply.[2]

The right to bring a private Federal antitrust action was created purely by an Act of Congress. Therefore, prior to such Congressional enactment, there did not exist

---

[2] This case is distinct from cases also involving pendent state claims. In such cases the exclusivity would not be present and Rule 11 would not preempt. See, i.e., *Business Guides, Inc. v. Chromatic Comm. Ent., Inc.*, 498 U.S. 533 (1991); *Cohen v. Lupo*, 927 F.2d 363 (8th Cir. 1991); *Lightning Lube, Inc. v. Witco Corp.*, 4 F.3d 1153 (3rd Cir. 1993). These three distinguishable cases were relied on by the Kansas Supreme Court. (App. 31).

any common law right to bring any action based on that Federal cause of action. Precluding the Federal antitrust defendant from bringing a State malicious prosecution or abuse of process action, *based on the filing* or continuation of the Federal antitrust action, does not limit or remove a right ever possessed under State law prior to the Federal enactment. Therefore, Congress did not eliminate a prior State right, but merely precluded any subsequent State actions based on that Federal claim to which Federal Courts were given exclusive jurisdiction.[3]

Congressional Incentives

In the creation of the Federal Antitrust Laws, Congress provided incentives to make antitrust laws more effective in protecting free and open competition.

> [I]t can be postulated with some certainty that it is not the policy of our national antitrust laws to discourage private treble damage actions such as this, to the contrary, Congress itself has placed the private antitrust litigant in a most favorable position through the enactment of § 5 of the Clayton Act . . . in the face of such a policy, this court should not add requirements to burden the private litigant beyond what is specifically set forth by Congress in those laws.

---

[3] Thus there is no conflict with the dicta in *Business Guides* that Rule 11 is not a Federal tort of malicious prosecution. For Federal claims that fall exclusively within Federal purview, dispositive motions and Rule 11 are the only recourse if one claims a lack of probable cause. If Federal claims are not exclusive or if pendent State claims are present, subsequent State actions are not preempted.

Leh v. General Petroleum Corp., 165 F. Supp. 933, 937 (D.C.S.D. Cal. 1958).

The antitrust laws permit successful antitrust plaintiffs attorneys' fees but do not permit successful antitrust defendants attorneys' fees *except via the specifically provided mechanism of Rule 11.* Permitting State malicious prosecution or abuse of process action by successful antitrust defendants would permit them to seek what Congress did not provide them, attorneys' fees. It is a huge disincentive to private litigants and their attorneys to permit an expensive and time consuming State action against Federal antitrust plaintiffs or their counsel seeking damages and attorneys' fees against Federal antitrust plaintiffs or their attorneys who could have otherwise survived Rule 11 motions in the original Federal action. Because any Rule 11 motion would be a part of the underlying antitrust action, there would not be an extensive additional expenditure of time or money in defending the Rule 11 motion. Also contrary to Congress' exclusive grant of the matter to Federal Courts, State Courts would be asked to make determinations of probable cause or improper purpose in an area where Congress has a great interest in encouraging private antitrust litigation and has placed its exclusive jurisdiction with the Federal Courts.

Dispositive motions and Rule 11 provide adequate protection from allegedly frivolous lawsuits without undermining the Congressional intent of providing strong incentives to bring private antitrust actions. "[I]n the absence of specific legislative authorization, attorneys' fees may not be awarded to defendants in private antitrust litigation. Our conclusion is based on policy

considerations reflected in the Clayton Act." *Byram Concretanks, Inc. v. Warren Concrete Products Co. of N.J.*, 374 F.2d 649, 651 (3rd Cir. 1966).

> [I]t is well known that if a primary objective of the private treble damage suit is to provide a means for enforcement of the antitrust laws in addition to Government prosecutions. The incentive which the prospect of treble damages provides for instituting private antitrust actions would be dampened by the threat of assessment of a defendant's attorneys' fees and other costs as a penalty for failure.

Id. The only authorization for attorneys' fees for antitrust defendants would be as permitted under Rule 11.

Rule 11 Is Sole Remedy for Areas of Exclusive Jurisdiction

Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is the remedy provided in the Federal system when a matter has allegedly been brought frivolously, for an improper purpose or if the allegations lack support. Fed.R.Civ.P. 11(b). The Federal Court, in considering Rule 11 sanctions, and with its familiarity with the case and the Federal antitrust probable cause standards, possesses the authority to award all or some of the reasonable attorneys' fees and other expenses incurred as a direct result of any violation. Fed.R.Civ.P. 11(c)(2).

Rule 11 is the only such remedy provided for all such alleged abuses in all cases brought before the Federal Courts. In cases where the Federal Court has before it matters of concurrent or pendent jurisdiction or actions in

which the Federal Court does not possess exclusive jurisdiction, Rule 11 is available but does not preempt other remedies, such as State remedies of malicious prosecution or abuse of process. However, in areas of exclusive Federal jurisdiction, Rule 11, alone or with other Federal rules or statutes that may be part of a specific Federal enactment,[4] preempts any State claim for malicious prosecution or abuse of process. This Court must clarify this by granting certiorari in this matter.

Various Courts have examined the issue of whether Rule 11 preempts State claims of malicious prosecution or abuse of process where there is exclusive jurisdiction of the underlying claim. The majority of these cases are in the area of bankruptcy or civil rights violation.[5] *Gonzales v. Parks*, 830 F.2d 1033 (9th Cir. 1987), held that State Courts are not authorized to determine whether a person's claim for relief under Federal law, in a Federal Court, within that Court's exclusive jurisdiction is an appropriate one.[6] *Id.* at 1035. Such an exercise of authority

---

[4] For example Bankruptcy Rule 9011, which is "substantially equivalent" to Rule 11, works in conjunction with Rule 11 to provide the basis for preemption. *In re Kouterick*, 167 B.R. 353 (Bcy. D. N.J. 1994); *Edmunds v. Lawrence Nat. Bank & Trust Co.*, 16 Kan. App. 2d 331, 823 P.2d 219 (1991).

[5] Relevant cases in addition to those discussed are: *Szabo Food Serv. Inc. v. Canteen Corp.*, 823 F.2d 1073 (7th Cir. 1987); *Mason v. Smith*, 672 A.2d 705 (N.H. 1996); *Smith v. Mitchell Constr. Co., Inc.*, 481 S.E.2d 558 (Ga. App. 1997); *Sarno v. Thermen*, 608 N.E.2d 11 (Ill. App. 1992).

[6] In contrast, the Kansas Supreme Court relied on three cases where pendent State claims were also asserted. *Business Guides*, 498 U.S. 533; *Cohen*, 927 F.2d 363; and *Lightning Lube*, 4 F.3d 1153.

would be inconsistent with and subvert the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Courts by allowing State Courts to create their own standards as to when persons may properly seek relief in cases Congress has specifically precluded those Courts from adjudicating. *Id.* The Kansas Supreme Court, in contrast to *Gonzales*, cited *Cohen v. Lupo*, 927 F.2d 363 (8th Cir. 1991).[7]

Several other Courts have determined that, when considering areas of exclusive jurisdiction, subsequent State malicious prosecution or abuse of process actions are preempted. A California Court, *Idell v. Goodman*, 224 Cal App. 3d 262, 273 Cal. Rptr. 605 (1990), held that a malicious prosecution case following a bankruptcy proceeding was preempted by Federal law. The Court explained:

> State Courts are not authorized to determine whether a person's claim for relief under a Federal law, in a Federal Court, and within the Federal Court's exclusive jurisdiction, is an appropriate one. . . . The Congress' grant to the Federal Courts of exclusive jurisdiction over bankruptcy petitions precludes collateral attacks on such petitions in State Courts is supported by the fact that remedies have been made available

---

[7] In *Cohen*, the Federal Court determined the securities fraud claim lacked probative evidence, granted summary judgment and issued Rule 11 sanctions for a portion of the legal fees expended. *Id.* at 364. The 8th Circuit held that the remaining attorney's fees could be sought in a State Court's malicious prosecution action. *Id.* at 365. The decision was based on *res judicata*, not preemption. *Id. Cohen* included pendent State claims. *See Bastien v. R. Rowland & Co.*, 631 F.Supp. 1554, 1557 (E.D. Mo. 1986).

> in the Federal Courts to creditors who believe that a filing is frivolous. Debtors filing bankruptcy petitions are subject to the requirements of good faith . . . , and violations of that requirement can result in the imposition of sanctions. Congress' authorization of certain sanctions for the filing of frivolous bankruptcy petitions should be read as an implicit rejection of other penalties including the kind of substantial damage awards that might be available in State Court tort suits.

Id. at 608-09, internal citations omitted.

The California Court, in analyzing the potential conflicts of Federal law, further stated:

> Even the mere possibility of being sued in State Court could in some instances deter persons from exercising their rights in bankruptcy. In any event, it is for Congress and the Federal Courts, not the State Courts, to decide what incentive and penalties are appropriate for use in connection with the bankruptcy process and when those incentives or penalties shall be utilized.

Id. at 609.

The problem is more than one of State Courts deciding issues of Federal law in one manner or another; the difficulty goes much deeper. *M.S.R.*, 74 F.3d at 914. It is a question of State Courts, in effect, interfering with the whole complex, reticulated process. *Id.*

The Court in *Furillo v. Dana Corp. Parish Div.*, 866 F.Supp. 842 (E.D. Pa. 1994), held that an employee's defamation claim arising out of a labor agreement dispute

was preempted under the Labor and Management Relations Act. The Court reasoned that allowing the State Court to delve into the underlying facts involving the collective bargaining agreement would violate the policy that the Federal Courts develop a uniform body of Federal labor laws. *Id.* at 851. The *Furillo* Court determined that "[a]ny resolution of this case under State tort theory would require the interpretation of the collective bargaining agreement and consequently the determination cannot be made by a State Court." *Id.* at 852. "The possibility of inconsistent results arising from such a double inquiry is precisely the type of situation that the preemption doctrine was meant to address." *Id.*

> Congress has specifically addressed the problem of abusive litigation when it promulgated Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. By explicitly delineating what rights a defendant has when an abusive claim based upon Federal law is brought against that party, Congress has simply pre-empted its entire area of law.

East-Bibb Twiggs Neighborhood v. Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Comm'n, 674 F. Supp. 1475, 1476-77 (N.D. Ga. 1987).

The *East-Bibb Twiggs* case was a Federal civil rights action. The *East-Bibb Twiggs* Court noted that if State abusive litigation claims were permitted on Federally-created rights, they could have a tremendous "chilling-effect" on the assertion of the Federally-created right. *Id.* at 1477. This logic is especially pertinent in Federal antitrust cases.

In *Great Western Bank v. Southeastern Bank*, 507 S.E.2d 191 (Ga. App. 1998), the Court cited *East-Bibb* favorably

and concluded that the Court of the forum in which the proceeding occurred has the overriding interest in determining questions concerning the sanctions to be imposed for litigation abuses in that proceeding.[8] *Id.*

In Federal antitrust cases, not only does the reasoning of these other Courts apply, but also because the antitrust laws are designed to protect competition, Congress does not want private litigants chilled by potential inconsistent State Court action.

Congress Encourages Private Enforcement

Congress established Federal antitrust laws to protect competition and the free market system. See *Twin Cities Sport Serv. v. Charles O. Finley & Co.*, 676 F.2d 1291 (9th Cir. 1982). In most cases alleged offenders are powerful entities with vast resources and those bringing the complaints are often entities or individuals without sufficient market influence and often with limited resources. It is in the interest of the public good, of commerce and free competition to encourage private antitrust suits. There would be a huge disincentive to private litigants and their attorneys if powerful entities were permitted to second guess and collaterally attack Federal Court decisions by bringing State claims for malicious prosecution or abuse of process. Permitting such State attacks could deter antitrust plaintiffs and their attorneys from using

---

[8] The Kansas Supreme Court relied on a California Appellant Court decision, *Roberto Del Rio v. Anthony Jetton*, 55 Cal. App. 3d 430 (1997). The *Del Rio* case considered only *East-Bibb* and rejected it without setting forth any legal support for its disagreement.

Federal antitrust laws and would subvert and contravene Congressional intent in protecting commerce and free and open competition through aggressive antitrust laws.

In a Federal antitrust case such as the one in question, where McShares wrote three "Rule 11" letters to Defendants but did not serve or file a Motion for Rule 11 sanctions, where the Federal District Court denied motions to dismiss, for summary judgment and for directed verdict and submitted the case to a jury – the State malicious prosecution action and abuse of process claim would be an attack on the Federal Court's determinations and rulings of probable cause in an area of exclusive Federal jurisdiction. Although there is a plethora of probable cause evidence in this case, these Defendants should not be exposed to the expense and distractions required to prevail on showing probable cause where the State Court is not the proper jurisdiction to examine probable cause in a Federal antitrust case.

This Court should issue its Writ of Certiorari, take this case and clearly establish that in cases where the only claim before the Federal Court is one of exclusive Federal jurisdiction, dispositive motions and Rule 11 are the only remedies for allegations of lack of probable cause, and subsequent State attacks are preempted. Determinations of probable cause by the Federal District Court are a vital and integral part of the Federal antitrust action and must be determined only by Federal Courts and not "second guessed" in State Court.

CONCLUSION

This Court should issue its Writ of Certiorari to the Kansas Supreme Court and resolve the question of whether State causes of action, such as malicious prosecution, can be subsequently brought when based solely on an underlying Federal claim in which the Federal Courts have exclusive jurisdiction. Congress' interests in protecting interstate and foreign commerce and competition is at least as compelling as its interest in uniformity in bankruptcy. When a claim is exclusively Federal, preemption is complete, and Rule 11 should be the exclusive remedy. Attacking the claim in a separate State action will require a great expense of time, energy and money relitigating and producing evidence demonstrating the existence of probable cause and the lack of improper purpose. The exact same type of evidence was produced to overcome Motions to Dismiss, for Summary Judgment and Directed Verdict. Permitting such attacks in a subsequent State action undermines the Congressional intent of encouraging antitrust plaintiffs and their attorneys to bring civil actions. If those actions are brought without probable cause, they can be quickly disposed of in Federal Court with any appropriate sanctions assessed through Rule 11. This issue is ripe for determination by this Honorable Court.

Petitioners respectfully request their Petition for Writ of Certiorari be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

ARLEN L TANNER #16411
Counsel of Record
NORMAN I. REICHEL #13573
WALLACE, SAUNDERS, AUSTIN,
BROWN & ENOCHS, CHARTERED
10111 West 87th Street, P.O. Box 12290
Overland Park, Kansas 66282
(913) 888-1000 FAX (913) 888-1065

and

NORMAN R. KELLY
NORTON, WASSERMAN, JONES & KELLY
215 South Santa Fe, P.O. Box 2388
Salina, Kansas 67402-2388
(785) 827-3646

Counsel for Petitioners
Donald D. Barry, Esq. and
Anthony S. Barry, Esq.

APPENDIX A

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

No. 80,527

McSHARES, INC.,
Appellant,

v.

DONALD D. BARRY, *et al.*,
Appellees.

SYLLALBUS BY THE COURT

1.

Absent an express statement by Congress that state law is preempted, preemption occurs where there is an actual conflict between federal and state law, where compliance with both federal and state law is, in effect, physically impossible, where Congress has occupied the entire field of regulation and leaves no room for states to supplement federal law, or when the state law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full objectives of Congress.

2.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 is a procedural tool to sanction counsel for frivolous or abusive litigation; it does not exclude the filing of a state action for malicious prosecution and abuse of process arising out of Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 1 *et seq.* (1994), litigation.

Appeal from Saline district court; DANIEL L. HEBERT, judge. Opinion filed December 18, 1998. Reversed and remanded.

Dianne M. Hansen and *Thomas M. Bradshaw*, of Armstrong, Teasdale, Schlafly & Davis, of Kansas City, Missouri, argued the cause, and *J. Stan Sexton*, of Hampton Royce Engleman & Nelson, of Salina, was with them on the briefs for appellant.

Arlen L. Tanner, of Wallace, Saunders, Austin, Brown & Enochs, Chartered, of Overland Park, argued the cause, and *Norman I. Reichel*, of the same firm, and *Norman R. Kelly*, of Norton, Wasserman, Jones & Kelly, of Salina, were with him on the brief for appellees Donald D. Barry and Anthony S. Barry.

Stephen J. Torline, of Blackwell Sanders Matheny Weary & Lombardi, LLP, of Overland Park, argued the cause, and *James D. Griffin*, of the same firm, was with him on the brief for appellee David H. Weinstein.

Catherine M. Walberg, of Goodell, Stratton, Edmonds & Palmer, L.L.P., of Topeka, argued the cause, and *Wayne T. Stratton*, of the same firm, was with her on the brief for appellees Barrack, Rodos & Bacine, a General Partnership, P.C.; Leonard Barrack, Leonard Barrack, P.C.; Gerald J. Rodos, P.C.; Daniel E. Bacine, P.C.; and Anthony J. Bolognese.

Richard T. Foster and *Robert G. Martin*, of McDonald, Tinker, Skaer, Quinn & Herrington, P.A., of Wichita, were on the brief for appellees Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C.; Joseph C. Kohn, Esq.; and Steven A. Ashen, Esq.

The opinion of the court was delivered by

ALLEGRUCCI, J.: This is an appeal from the district court's dismissal of the petition of McShares, Inc.,

(McShares) for damages for alleged malicious prosecution and abuse of process. The defendants/appellees are individual attorneys and law firms who represented claimants against McShares in a prior federal court class action under the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.* (1994), which concluded with a jury verdict in favor of McShares. The appeal was transferred from the Court of Appeals to this court.

The district court dismissed the petition in the present case on the ground that the subject matter is preempted by operation of federal law and procedure. The sole issue in this appeal is whether the state court claims of malicious prosecution and abuse of process arising out of the Sherman Antitrust Act litigation are preempted by federal law.

Material facts are not in dispute. The district court's journal entry of judgment recites that defendants had filed various motions requesting judgment on the pleadings, dismissal of the action, and summary judgment. The district court had requested the parties to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, and the journal entry of judgment contains findings of fact and conclusions of law. It does not appear that all the district court's findings of fact are from the pleadings. For this reason, the trial court's action will be deemed to be an entry of summary judgment in favor of defendants/appellees and against McShares. K.S.A. 60-212(b) and (c).

There is nothing in the record, docketing statement, or briefs to indicate that any challenges have been or are being raised to the district court's findings of fact. The district court's determinations of fact, therefore, are final

and conclusive. *Justice v. Board of Wyandotte County Comm'rs*, 17 Kan. App. 2d 102, 109, 835 P.2d 692, *rev. denied* 251 Kan. 938 (1992).

The district court's findings of fact are as follows:

"1. On or about November 27, 1996, Plaintiff filed a Petition for damages against the Defendants herein alleging claims for malicious prosecution and abuse of process.

"2. Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants acted without probable cause and with malice, and improperly and for an ulterior purpose and motive in filing against and continued prosecution of Plaintiff in *Albert City Elevator Co. v. Pestcon Sys., Inc., et al.*, Case No 93-CV-2496, in the United States District Court for the District of Kansas.

"3. The Defendants are individual attorneys and law firms who represented the claimants against the Plaintiffs herein in the prior Federal Court action.

"4. The prior Federal Court action against Plaintiff was premised solely upon alleged civil violations of Federal anti-trust laws, specifically the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*

"5. Without detailing the somewhat convoluted procedural history of the prior Federal Court case, the action consisted of several individual class action lawsuits against various parties filed pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which cases were eventually consolidated and tried under procedures set forth in the Federal Court Manual for Management of Complex Litigation.

"6. After extensive pre-trial proceedings, the Federal case was tried to a jury which returned, inter alia, a verdict in favor of Plaintiff herein against the claims of the parties represented by the Defendants herein.

"7. No motion or other action was filed by the Plaintiff herein in the prior Federal case suggesting that any pleading filed by any of the Defendants herein was frivolous, unwarranted or filed for any improper purpose."

Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and the movants are entitled to judgment as a matter of law. K.S.A.1997 Supp. 60-256(c). On appeal of a case like the present one where there is no dispute as to the material issues, this court's review of the district court's conclusions of law is unlimited. *Gillespie v. Seymour*, 250 Kan. 123, 129, 823 P.2d 782 (1991).

The district court reasoned that because federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction of Sherman Act antitrust actions, a state court is preempted from entertaining abusive litigation claims arising from an antitrust action. In its conclusions of law, the district court stated that adjudication of McShares' malicious prosecution and abuse of process claims would require resolution of complex issues under the Sherman Act, would create potential for impermissible conflict in interpretation and application of a complex federal act, might obstruct accomplishment and execution of Congress' purposes in enacting the Act, and might have a chilling effect on persons exercising their rights under the Act because a subsequent state court action effectively would constitute

a collateral attack on the federal court proceeding. The district court cited *East-Bibb Twiggs Neighborhood v. Macon-Bibb Plan.*, 674 F.Supp. 1475 (M.D. Ga. 1987), and *Edmonds v. Lawrence Nat'l Bank & Tr. Co.*, 16 Kan. App. 2d 331, 823 P.2d 219 (1991), for the principle that state court remedies are preempted by the combined operation of federal law and procedure. Citing *Edmonds*, the district court declared: "Kansas clearly recognizes that where Congress has preempted a particular field by an award of exclusive jurisdiction, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure No. 11 preempts any state cause of action for abuse of process or malicious prosecution arising out of cases so exclusively reserved." The district court distinguished *Business Guides v. Chromatic Comm.*, 498 U.S. 533, 112 L. Ed. 2d 1140 111 S. Ct. 922 (1991), *Lightning Lube, Inc. v. Witco Corp.*, 4 F.3d 1153 (3d Cir. 1993), and *Cohen v. Lupo*, 927 F.2d 363 (8th Cir. 1991).

On appeal, McShares contends that the district court's reliance on *Edmonds* and *East-Bibb Twiggs* was in error. McShares would distinguish Edmonds and the cases cited therein on the ground that the underlying federal action was in bankruptcy. McShares would distinguish *East-Bibb Twiggs* on the ground that the underlying federal action was a civil rights action. Bankruptcy has the double distinction of being a field that is completely occupied by federal law and of containing its own remedy for frivolous or malicious proceedings. Civil rights is a field in which federal and state law operate concurrently, but federal civil rights legislation, unlike the Sherman Act, includes a remedy for frivolous or malicious proceedings.

In *Edmonds*, the district court entered summary judgment in favor of the defendant bank, holding that Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 11 and Fed. R. Bankr. Proc. 9011 preempted any state action for malicious prosecution or abuse of process that arose from the bank's filing of a complaint to revoke the Edmondses' discharge granted by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court. 16 Kan. App. 2d at 331-32. The Court of Appeals affirmed.

The Court of Appeals considered but passed on *East-Bibb Twiggs* and *Cohen*, which had been cited by the Edmondses for the proposition that Rule 11 is a procedural tool that cannot alter or eliminate substantive state law. The court settled on *Gonzales v. Parks*, 830 F.2d 1033 (9th Cir. 1987), as a more persuasive federal case. Barbara Parks held a deed of trust, which she sought to foreclose, on the Gonzaleses' real property. The sale was halted when the Gonzaleses filed a petition in bankruptcy. In California state court, Parks filed an action claiming that the bankruptcy filing constituted an abuse of process. The Gonzaleses filed an adversary proceeding in the bankruptcy court against Parks and her counsel, Jerome Parks, seeking relief from the state court action. The bankruptcy court granted summary judgment in favor of the Gonzaleses, and that action was affirmed by the federal district court and the Court of Appeals. 830 F.2d at 1034-35. Our Court of Appeals quoted the following passage from the opinion of the federal Court of Appeals:

> " 'Implicit in the Parkses' appeal is the notion that state courts have subject matter jurisdiction to hear a claim that the filing of a

> bankruptcy petition constitutes an abuse of process. We disagree with that assumption. Filings of bankruptcy petitions are a matter of exclusive federal jurisdiction. State courts are not authorized to determine whether a person's claim for relief under federal law, in a federal court, and within that court's exclusive jurisdiction, is an appropriate one. Such an exercise of authority would be inconsistent with and subvert the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal courts by allowing state courts to create their own standards as to when persons may properly seek relief in cases Congress has specifically precluded those courts from adjudicating. [Citation omitted.] . . . The ability collaterally to attack bankruptcy petitions in state courts would also threaten the uniformity of federal bankruptcy law. . . . ' 830 F.2d at 1035." 16 Kan. App. 2d at 333-34.

Noting that *Gonzales* involved filing of a bankruptcy petition and the Edmondses were complaining of a complaint to revoke their discharge in bankruptcy, the Court of Appeals concluded that the same principles governed both situations. The Court of Appeals also examined a California state court case, *Idell v. Goodman*, 224 Cal. App. 3d 262, 273 Cal. Rptr. 605 (1990). From that case, the Court of Appeals quoted the following: "The *Idell* court stated that 'the reasoning of *Gonzales* bears repeating. The existence of federal sanctions for the filing of a frivolous and malicious bankruptcy pleading must be read as an implicit rejection of state court remedies.' 224 Cal. App. 3d at 271." 16 Kan. App. 2d at 334. Thus persuaded by the reasoning of *Gonzales* and *Idell*, the Court of Appeals concluded that "state court remedies are not available for

seeking redress for allegations of frivolous and malicious bankruptcy actions." 16 Kan. App. 2d at 334.

In 1987, at the time it considered *Gonzales*, the Ninth Circuit court was "able to find only one other case where a state court considered a claim that filing a bankruptcy petition constituted an abuse of process." 830 F.2d at 1035 n.5. The question seems to have arisen several times in the meantime. Since *Edmonds* was decided in 1991, it has been cited with approval by courts in four federal circuits. All are bankruptcy cases.

McShares argues that the principles upon which the Court of Appeals based its decision in *Edmonds* do not extend to nonbankruptcy areas of law. Bankruptcy law is unique to the federal court system, but the states share parallel authority with the federal government in other fields, such as civil rights, antitrust, and securities regulation. In addition, federal bankruptcy law includes sanctions tailored for frivolous and malicious bankruptcy filings. Fed. R. Bankr. Proc. 9011. According to McShares, because federal legislation neither completely occupies the field of antitrust nor provides sanctions specific to it, *Edmonds* is not controlling and remedies for abusive federal antitrust litigation should not be restricted to federal courts.

Like *Edmonds*, *East-Bibb Twiggs* restricts remedies for abusive federal litigation to those available under federal law. In the federal civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1994), a defendant filed a counterclaim for abusive litigation based on Georgia state law. The federal district court granted plaintiff's motion to dismiss the counterclaim, noting that Congress provided a remedy in

42 U.S.C. § 1988 (1994) for one who has to defend against a frivolous § 1983 action. It further noted that Rule 11 specifically addresses the problem of abusive litigation. "By explicitly delineating what rights a defendant has when an abusive claim based upon federal law is brought against that party, Congress has simply pre-empted this entire area of the law, and accordingly, [Georgia state law] has no application to this case." 674 F. Supp. at 1476-77. The district court stated:

> "Congress' unwillingness to provide specifically for special damages other than litigation costs, damages for mental distress, and nominal damages in any of the statutes designed to deter abusive litigation, indicates to this court that Congress did not believe that such damages should be recoverable in these federal causes of action." 674 F. Supp. at 1477.

McShares would minimize the persuasive force of *East-Bibb Twiggs* in this case. First, McShares asserts that it "is the **only** case outside of the bankruptcy area which has ever held that federal law and federal procedure preempt independent state law claims for abusive litigation which arises from actions based on federal law." Defendants have not contradicted McShares' assertion.

We have found one other nonbankruptcy case supporting preemption, and it, like *East-Bibb Twiggs*, is from Georgia. *Great Western Bank v. Southeastern Bank*, 234 Ga. App. 400, ___ S.E.2d ___ (1998). It was decided after the parties submitted their briefs in the present case. In a prior federal court action, Great Western Bank charged an automobile dealership, its owners, and Southeastern Bank with violations of the state and federal racketeering

statutes (RICO). Southeastern Bank's motion to dismiss it from the federal action was granted, and it brought the state court action against Great Western Bank and its attorneys under a Georgia abusive litigation statute. The state trial court denied Great Western Bank's motion to dismiss, which argued the principle that Rule 11 provided the exclusive remedy. On interlocutory appeal, the Court of Appeals of Georgia reversed. It held that the state court action could not be maintained because Southeastern Bank had the remedy of Rule 11 sanctions available in the underlying federal litigation.

The Georgia appellate court's rationale is not very convincing. The decision was based on its perception of the intent of the state legislature in enacting the abusive litigation measure and the intent of Congress with regard to Rule 11 and other federal statutes. In discerning the federal intent, the court examined seven decisions from federal district courts in Georgia. *East-Bibb Twiggs* was among them. All the cases but one involved the Georgia common-law abusive litigation remedy that had been superseded by the abusive litigation statute at issue. According to the Georgia appellate court, only in one case, *Chromatics, Inc. v. Telex Computer Products, Inc.*, 695 F. Supp. 1184 (N.D. Ga. 1988), did the court hold that it had jurisdiction of the abusive litigation claim. From the federal cases embracing the majority rule, the Georgia court seems to have drawn the conclusion that Congress intended Rule 11 to be the exclusive remedy for abusive litigation. From the Georgia court's synopses of the federal courts' holdings, however, only *East-Bibb Twiggs* really supports the conclusion. By the Georgia court's reckoning, in two cases "the courts characterized [the

common-law abusive litigation] claim as a permissive counterclaim under federal law, thereby holding that they were without subject matter jurisdiction of the claim in a non-diversity case." 234 Ga. App. at 423. In two other cases,

> "the courts held that [the common-law abusive litigation] claim may not be raised in federal court even if as a permissive counterclaim it satisfies requirements for diversity jurisdiction, because it is arguably a procedural device which federal courts would not be subject to follow under the Erie doctrine and not a substantive cause of action." 234 Ga. App. at 423.

In another case, the abusive litigation claim was dismissed for failure to give required notice. After reviewing state and federal law for legislative intent, the court finished its opinion by analogizing to an unspecified provision of the Restatement (Second) of the Conflict of Laws that governs relationships between courts of different states: "The court of the forum in which the proceeding occurred has the overriding interest in determining questions concerning the sanctions to be imposed for litigation abuses in that proceeding." 234 Ga. App. at 424.

A California state court has expressly disagreed with the holding of *East-Bibb Twiggs*. In *Del Rio v. Jetton*, 55 Cal. App. 4th 30, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 712 (1997), the Court of Appeal reversed a trial court's dismissal of a malicious prosecution action brought by police officers who had been defendants in a federal civil rights action. *East-Bibb Twiggs* was the only case cited to the Court of Appeal on the preemption issue. 55 Cal. App. 4th at 37. With regard to the Georgia case, the California court stated:

> "The fact that Congress has provided certain remedies to a party forced to defend a meritless civil rights claim, or who is subjected to baseless court filings, does not demonstrate an intent to preclude a subsequent state tort action where the claim was not only frivolous or entirely without merit, but also was motivated by actual malice against the defendant. The risk of a 'chilling effect' is limited to those plaintiffs whose intent in filing a civil rights claim is malicious. There is no basis in history or logic to conclude that Congress intended to encourage such claims." 55 Cal. App. 4th at 37-38.

The second reason McShares gives for not applying *East-Bibb Twiggs* is that "civil rights litigants have an exclusive federal law remedy for recovery of attorneys' fees and costs by the prevailing party," 42 U.S.C. § 1988, that is not available to litigants in other areas of federal law, including antitrust. As we have seen, the California court did not even believe that civil rights litigants' remedies should be limited to those provided by the federal statute and rule.

The third reason McShares suggests for downplaying the significance of *East-Bibb Twiggs* is that the remedies provided by Rule 11 have been significantly limited by amendments since *East-Bibb Twiggs*. The case cited by *McShares, Kiser v. Boeing Co.*, 163 F.R.D. 13 (D. Kan. 1995), for the proposition that the 1993 amendments defanged Rule 11, lends little support for that general proposition and is readily distinguishable from the present case. Comparison of Rule 11 before and after the amendments, however, confirms that the breadth of the remedies has been narrowed.

In the present case, the district court's reasoning depends on a precise identity of federal preemption of bankruptcy proceedings and federal jurisdiction of actions brought under a federal antitrust statute. The two are not precisely the same, however, and the difference between them is significant.

Congressional power to preempt state law is derived from the Supremacy Clause of Art. VI of the United States Constitution. In deciding that Congress' enactment of the Communications Act and creation of the Federal Communications Commission had not preempted state regulation of certain aspects of intrastate ratemaking, the United States Supreme Court reviewed the various theories of preemption:

> "Pre-emption occurs when Congress, in enacting a federal statute, expresses a clear intent to pre-empt state law, *Jones v. Rath Packing Co.*, 430 U.S. 519 (1977), when there is outright or actual conflict between federal and state law, *e.g., Free v. Bland*, 369 U.S. 663 (1962), where compliance with both federal and state law is in effect physically impossible, *Florida Lime & Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Paul*, 373 U.S. 132 (1963), where there is implicit in federal law a barrier to state regulation, *Shaw v. Delta Air Lines, Inc.* 463 U.S. 85 (1983), where Congress has legislated comprehensively, thus occupying an entire field of regulation and leaving no room for the States to supplement federal law, *Rice v. Santa Fe Elevator Corp.*, 331 U.S. 218 (1947), or where the state law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full objectives of Congress.

Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U.S. 52 (1941)." *Louisiana Public Service Comm'n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 368-69, L. Ed. 2d 369, 106 S. Ct. 1890 (1986).

Congress was charged with establishing "uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States." U.S. Const., art. I, § 8. Thus, it enacted the Bankruptcy Act, 11 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.* (1994)-and delegated power to the Supreme Court to prescribe bankruptcy procedural rules, 28 U.S.C. § 2075 (1994), and established the system of bankruptcy courts. Preemption occurs in bankruptcy law because the Constitution grants Congress plenary powers over bankruptcies, and the preemption is preemption of the field.

Antitrust law presents a different picture. Federal antitrust law is comprised of not one comprehensive act, but rather several narrower statutory schemes that were passed at various times in response to various historical stimuli. See Historical and Statutory Notes, Codifications, U.S.C.A., Title 15, Ch. 1; 15 U.S.C. § 12(a) (1994). The Sherman Act, which dates from the late 19th century, comprises §§ 1 to 7 of Title 15. It confers jurisdiction "to prevent and restrain violations of sections 1 to 7 of this title" on the federal courts, 15 U.S.C. § 4 (1994), and that jurisdiction is exclusive. *Blumenstock Bros. v. Curtis Pub. Co.*, 252 U.S. 436, 440, 64 L. Ed. 649, 40 S. Ct. 385 (1920).

In *California v. ARC America Corp.*, 490 U.S. 93, 104 L. Ed. 2d 86, 109 S. Ct. 1661 (1989), the Supreme Court held that, even though under federal law indirect purchasers are prohibited from recovering damages for violations of federal antitrust laws, indirect purchasers were permitted to recover under state antitrust law in a case where both federal and state antitrust laws were

involved. The Supreme Court's reasoning included the precept that antitrust is an area of the law traditionally regulated by the states: "Given the long history of state common-law and statutory remedies against monopolies and unfair business practices, it is plain that this is an area traditionally regulated by the States." 490 U.S. at 101. Thus, the court applied the "presumption against finding pre-emption of state law in areas traditionally regulated by the States." 490 U.S. at 101. The Supreme Court further stated: "Congress intended the federal antitrust laws to supplement, not displace, state antitrust remedies. 21 Cong. Rec. 2457 (1890) (remarks of Sen. Sherman)," and "on several prior occasions, the Court has recognized that the federal antitrust laws do not preempt state law." 490 U.S. at 102. Thus, the Supreme Court found nothing in the Sherman Act that manifests a congressional intent to preclude state regulation of antitrust matters. Nor is there an express statement by Congress that state law is preempted. In the absence of federal preemption of the field of antitrust law, the Kansas Legislature devoted much of Chapter 50 of the Kansas statutes to regulation of restraint of trade and unfair trade practices. Thus, there is no field preemption, and all that remains for our consideration is the possibility of conflict preemption. *Louisiana Public Service Comm'n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. at 368-69. See *Elkins v. Showcase, Inc.*, 237 Kan. 720, 727, 704 P.2d 977 (1985).

In *Del Rio v. Jetton*, 55 Cal. App. 4th 30, the defendants argued that by enacting 42 U.S.C. § 1988, Congress intended to occupy the entire field of remedies for civil rights actions. The California Court of Appeal disagreed, pointing out that subjective bad faith is not required for

an award of attorney fees under § 1988, whereas "[i]n contrast, a successful action for malicious prosecution in California requires proof not only that the underlying action was brought without probable cause, but also that it was initiated or continued with malice." 55 Cal. App. 4th at 36. Further, § 1988 is limited to recovery of fees and costs and provides no recovery for damages to reputation or emotional distress resulting from a civil rights violation.

The California Court of Appeal found no conflict between state and federal law that would mandate preemption:

> "State law is preempted to the extent that it actually conflicts with federal law, as when it is impossible for a private party to comply with both state and federal requirements, or when the state law imposes an obstacle to the accomplishment of the will of Congress. [Citation omitted.] No such obstacle exists in this case. Congress intended the fee-shifting provision in section 1988 to encourage plaintiffs to bring good faith civil rights actions, and to deter plaintiffs from bringing civil rights actions which lack foundation. A tort action for malicious prosecution against a plaintiff who brought a civil rights action without foundation, *and* with malice does not conflict with either of those purposes." 55 Cal. App. 4th at 36-37.

We find the California court's rationale persuasive and agree that no conflict exists that would preempt our state law.

In the present case, only the Barrack defendants argue that federal antitrust law preempts McShares' malicious prosecution and abuse of process claims. Aside from *East-Bibb Twiggs*, the cases they cite for this proposition are from the fields of bankruptcy and labor relations, both of which, according to Barrack defendants, entirely displace state law, citing *Char v. Matson Terminals Inc.*, 817 F. Supp. 850, 858 (D. Hawaii 1992) (former employee's defamation claim preempted by federal labor law). They cite no authority that would support the proposition that federal antitrust regulation entirely displaces state law.

The other appellees adhere more closely to the district court's rationale. They contend that Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 11 preempts state common-law actions for malicious prosecution and abuse of process that arise out of antitrust litigation because it is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal courts. In other words, they contend that the exclusive remedy for a party that has been the target of a malicious Sherman Act lawsuit is under Rule 11. Even the Barrack defendants contend that Congress' authorization of Rule 11 "sanctions for the filing of frivolous antitrust petitions should be read as an implicit rejection of other penalties including the kind of substantial damage awards that might be available in state court tort suits." This is the crux of their case, but appellees cite no authority that unqualifiedly supports it.

As we have seen, *Edmonds* and *Gonzales* are bankruptcy cases. That field of substantive law is completely occupied by federal law, and sanctions were authorized by a federal bankruptcy procedural rule as well as by Rule 11. *East-Bibb Twiggs* is a federal civil rights action in

which sanctions were statutorily authorized. Rule 11 was not an exclusive remedy in those cases.

Nor is Rule 11 a remedy that excludes tort remedies. In *Cohen v. Lupo*, 927 F.2d 363 (8th Cir. 1991), the federal Court of Appeals reversed the district court's dismissal of Cohen's malicious prosecution complaint. Cohen, along with more than 30 others, had been sued by clients of the law firm of Lupo & Stemmler on unmeritorious allegations of securities fraud. After 4 years of discovery produced no probative evidence of fraud, the district court granted summary judgment in favor of Cohen. Upon Cohen's Rule 11 motion, the district court awarded $100,000 for bad faith conduct. Then, Cohen filed a malicious prosecution suit seeking to recover the other $900,000 in fees and costs he had incurred in defending against the securities fraud allegations. The district court dismissed the malicious prosecution complaint on the ground that imposition of Rule 11 sanctions was res judicata. The Court of Appeals disagreed:

> "Rule 11 and the tort of malicious prosecution differ in their nature, the elements of the claims, and the potential remedies.
>
> "The district court did not decide whether the [original action] complaint was filed without probable cause, whether Lupo & Stemmler acted with malice, or the amount of damages Cohen suffered as a result of Lupo & Stemmler's misconduct. Those inquiries are irrelevant under Rule 11, but are the sum and substance of the tort of malicious prosecution. The nucleus of operative fact necessary to maintain an action for malicious prosecution includes the conclusion of the underlying action. Whether Cohen

would be victorious in the [original] litigation could not have been determined until the conclusion of that case.

"Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 grants a court discretion to discipline parties and counsel for conducting litigation in bad faith or in a frivolous and abusive fashion. Rule 11 is a procedural tool that under the Rules Enabling Act can not 'abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right.' 28 U.S.C. § 2072. Rule 11 sanctions must be sought by motion in a pending case; there can be no independent cause of action instituted for Rule 11 sanctions. *Port Drum Co. v. Umphrey*, 852 F.2d 148, 151 (5th Cir. 1988).

"On the other hand, the common law tort of malicious prosecution is a claim in its own right under applicable state law. In Missouri, malicious prosecution requires proof that: (1) the underlying offending lawsuit was initiated or maintained without probable cause; (2) the plaintiff in the initial suit acted with malice; (3) the proceeding terminated in favor of the defendant; and (4) the defendant suffered damages as a result of the suit. *Stafford v. Muster*, 582 S.W.2d 670, 675 (Mo. 1979). Rule 11 can not abridge the substantive state law of malicious prosecution, nor was it adopted to serve as a surrogate for an action based upon a claim of malicious prosecution resulting from frivolous, harassing, or vexatious litigation.

"The district court recognized that the $100,000 award under Rule 11 represented merely 'a fraction of the fees and costs incurred by [Cohen].' Lupo & Stemmler subjected Cohen to years of vexatious litigation and induced

> costs far exceeding that of the original investment. Cohen should have the chance to prove that [the original action] was conducted in such bad faith that it constituted malicious prosecution and, if successful in so proving, be compensated for his loss." 927 F.2d at 365.

In *Del Rio*, the California Court of Appeal also found no merit in the defendants' preemption argument based upon Rule 11. As we previously noted, the court disagreed with the holding in *East-Bibb Twiggs*. In rejecting the defendants' Rule 11 preemption argument, the court stated:

> "In *Business Guides, Inc. v. Chromatic Communications Enterprises, Inc.* (1991) 498 U.S. 533, 553 [111 S. Ct. 922, 934, 112-L. Ed. 2d 1140], the Supreme Court rejected a claim that rule 11 created a federal common law tort of malicious prosecution. 'The main objective of the Rule is not to reward parties who are victimized by litigation; it is to deter baseless filings and curb abuses. . . . [W]e are confident that district courts will resist the temptation to use sanctions as substitutes for tort damages.' Nothing in rule 11 indicates an intent to occupy the entire field of groundless suits brought for malicious purpose, nor is there any conflict between rule 11 and a damages action for such malicious prosecution." 55 Cal. App. 4th at 37.

In the present case, the district court dismissed the applicability of *Cohen* on the ground that it "arose out of general civil litigation and was not premised upon a specifically preemptive Federal statute." For the same reason, the district court distinguished *Business Guides* and *Lightning Lube* from the present case. Examination of

those three opinions reveals that the subject matter of each lawsuit is federally controlled and that in each lawsuit pendent state claims were asserted. *Cohen* involved securities, *Business Guides* involved copyright infringement, and *Lightning Lube* involved RICO. See 15 U.S.C. § 77a *et seq.* (1994); 17 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.* (1994); and 18 U.S.C. § 1961 *et seq.* (1994).

Even if the district court's characterization of *Cohen, Business Guides,* and *Lightning Lube* as involving only "general civil litigation" were accurate, it would not be a sound reason for rejecting the principle they carry – Rule 11 is not an exclusive remedy, no matter what category of substantive law is involved. Rule 11 is a procedural tool with the central purpose of deterring unfounded claims, defenses, and contentions in federal district court. "Rule 11 sanctions are not tied to the outcome of litigation; the relevant inquiry is whether a *specific filing* was, if not successful, at least well founded. Nor do sanctions shift the entire cost of litigation; *they shift only the cost of a discrete event.*" (Emphasis added.) 498 U.S. at 553. The Advisory Committee Notes contain the following comments on the 1993 amendments to Rule 11:

> *"Rule 11 is not the exclusive source for control of improper presentations of claims, defenses, or contentions.* It does not supplant statutes permitting awards of attorney's fees to prevailing parties or alter the principles governing such awards. It does not inhibit the court in punishing for contempt, in exercising its inherent powers, or in imposing sanctions, awarding expenses, or directing remedial action authorized under other rules or under 28 U.S.C. § 1927. *See Chambers v. NASCO,* [501 U.S. 32, 115 L. Ed. 2d 27, 111

> S. Ct. 2123] (1991). . . . Finally, it should be noted that *Rule 11 does not preclude a party from initiating an independent action for malicious prosecution or abuse of process."* (Emphasis added.)

Given that Rule 11 would not bar McShares' bringing an independent action against the defendants/appellees for malicious prosecution or abuse of process in federal district court, the present state court action should not be dismissed on the ground that Rule 11 is an exclusive remedy.

Having concluded that the entire field of antitrust has not been preempted by federal law and that Rule 11 is not an exclusive remedy, all that remains for our consideration are issues of state public policy that the parties have called to the court's attention.

A state malicious prosecution action will lie only where the outcome of the federal case was favorable to the state court plaintiff. In that circumstance, the decision already has been made that there was no actionable antitrust violation by the state court plaintiff. The state court action would not include a redetermination of the question whether its plaintiff violated antitrust law. The determinations that would be made in the state court action would be whether there was probable cause for the federal action plaintiffs to allege that the state court plaintiff committed violations of antitrust law and, if not, whether the allegations were made with malice. *Lindenman v. Umscheid*, 255 Kan. 610, 624, 875 P.2d 964 (1994). Those determinations would not cause different results from the federal action. Nor is there potential for a different result in the abuse of process count. The essential elements of the action are a knowingly illegal or improper use of the

process done for the purpose of harassing or causing hardship, which resulted in damage to the state court plaintiff. *Porter v. Stormont-Vail Hospital,* 228 Kan. 641, 653-54, 621 P.2d 411 (1980).

With regard to potential for contravening federal policy, defendants/appellees suggest that state courts' entertaining malicious prosecution actions by successful federal antitrust litigants will dampen the enthusiasm for private parties' bringing antitrust actions. They cite antitrust case law endorsing a federal policy of encouraging privately prosecuted actions. The federal policy, however, does not extend to encouraging unfounded private antitrust actions. Moreover, for earnest private federal antitrust plaintiffs, the incentive of treble damage awards, 15 U.S.C. § 15(a) (1994), probably outweighs whatever disincentive might be posed by the possibility of a state court action for malicious prosecution.

In the same vein, it is argued by defendants/appellees that the state court action constitutes a collateral attack on the federal court judgment and that the state court's entertaining it would frustrate finality. Rather than being challenged, the finality of the federal court judgment is a necessary element in a malicious prosecution action. As for the perpetuation of litigation between or among the parties to the underlying antitrust action, there is no federal policy that defendants/appellees can point to that would preclude or even discourage a party injured by wrongful litigation from seeking redress. That the redress for malicious prosecution is being sought in a subsequent suit rather than as an adjunct proceeding in the underlying action would seem to be necessitated by the requirement of finality.

In its journal entry of judgment, the district court stated that even if the substantive law of the present case were not preempted, McShares' claims were barred "by operation of Federal . . . procedure." In particular, the statute of limitations and personal jurisdiction questions raised by some of the defendants "would require resolution of complex issues arising out of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. . . . Such determinations would certainly present a potential conflict in the interpretation of specific Federal procedural rules by a State Court of an area clearly within the exclusive province of the Federal Courts." This reasoning could apply to any state malicious prosecution action in which the underlying suit was in federal court regardless whether the substantive law was state or federal. Thus, by its own overbreadth, the rationale is self-defeating.

Finally, defendant Weinstein contends that this court's deciding that McShares' claims are actionable in state court would amount to usurpation of the legislative authority of Congress and, thus, violates the doctrine of separation of powers. Leaving aside the question of whether interaction of the federal legislative and state judicial branches falls within the doctrine, we can turn to the substance of the contention for a simple resolution of it. Weinstein's position is that Congress' failure to promulgate or enact an antitrust analogue to Bankruptcy Rule 9011 or 42 U.S.C. § 1988 limits remedies to Rule 11 sanctions. In other words, the premise of his argument is that Rule 11 is the exclusive remedy so that any tort remedy would be usurpation of the legislative function. As discussed above, the premise of the argument is faulty.

We conclude the district court erred in dismissing appellant's petition on the ground that appellant's claims were preempted by federal law. We note that the parties briefed additional issues, none of which was decided by the district court; thus, they were not subject to being cross-appealed or considered by this court on appeal.

The judgment of the district court is reversed, and the case is remanded for further consideration in conformity with this opinion.

APPENDIX B

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
SALINE COUNTY, KANSAS

MCSHARES, INC.,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Case No.
	)	96-CVC-456
vs	)	
	)	
DONALD D. BARRY, ET AL.,	)	
	)	

JOURNAL ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

(Filed Dec. 18, 1997)

On October 10, 1997, the above-captioned case came on for hearing on the various motions filed by the several Defendants herein, requesting judgment on the pleadings, dismissal of the action, and/or for summary judgment. Plaintiff appeared by Attorneys J. Stan Sexton and Thomas Bradshaw. Defendants appeared by Attorneys Arlen Tanner, Norman Kelly, Richard Foster, Wayne Stratton and James Griffin. After hearing extensive oral argument, the Court requested the parties to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law by November 3, 1997, whereupon the Court took the matter under advisement.

FINDINGS

For purposes of the conclusions hereinafter set forth, the Court finds as follows:

1. On or about November 27, 1996, Plaintiff filed a Petition for damages against the Defendants herein alleging claims for malicious prosecution and abuse of process.

2. Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants acted without probable cause and with malice, and improperly and for an ulterior purpose and motive in filing against and continued prosecution of Plaintiff in *Albert City Elevator Co. v. Pestcon Sys., Inc., et al.* Case No. 93-CV-2496, in the United States District Court for the District of Kansas.

3. The Defendants are individual attorneys and law firms who represented the claimants against the Plaintiff's herein in the prior Federal Court action.

4. The prior Federal Court action against Plaintiff was premised solely upon alleged civil violations of Federal anti-trust laws, specifically the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, et seq.

5. Without detailing the somewhat convoluted procedural history of the prior Federal Court case, the action consisted of several individual class action lawsuits against various parties filed pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which cases were eventually consolidated and tried under procedures set forth in the Federal Court Manual for Management of Complex Litigation.

6. After extensive pre-trial proceedings, the Federal case was tried to a jury which returned, inter alia, a verdict in favor of Plaintiff herein against the claims of the parties represented by the Defendants herein.

7. No motion or other action was filed by the Plaintiff herein in the prior Federal case suggesting that any pleading filed by any of the Defendants herein was frivolous, unwarranted or filed for any improper purpose.

CONCLUSIONS

1. A determination of Plaintiff's cause of action alleged herein would require resolution of complex issues arising under a specific Federal statute, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, et seq.

2. Actions arising under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Courts, and issues arising under such statute are beyond the jurisdiction of the State Courts, 15 U.S.C. § 4, § 1.

3. Determination of issues under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act would create the potential for impermissible conflict in interpretation and application of a complex Federal law, and would stand as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress.

4. Assumption of jurisdiction by a state court over such controversies could also deter persons from exercising their rights under the specific Federal law if such exercise could subject them to a subsequent state action which would essentially present a collateral attack questioning the powers and determinations of the Federal Courts in an area within their exclusive jurisdiction.

5. The fact that some states have some form of "anti-trust" laws is essentially irrelevant to the fact that proceedings under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act – a specific Federal Statute – are within the exclusive province of the Federal Courts.

6. Although counsel have cited no specific cases involving the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, Kansas clearly

recognizes that where Congress has preempted a particular field by an award of exclusive jurisdiction, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure No. 11 preempts any state cause of action for abuse of process or malicious prosecution arising out of cases so exclusively reserved. *Edmonds v. Lawrence National Bank and Trust Co.*, 16 Kan.App.2d 331 (1991).

7. *Edmonds* is premised upon the Federal preemption of bankruptcy law and procedure by specific Federal Statutes, and cites the Federal case of *Gonzales v. Parks*, 830 F.2d 1033 (9th Cir. 1987), in support of its ruling.

8. In *East-Bibb Twiggs Neighborhood Association v. Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning Commission*, 674 F.Supp. 1475 (M.D.Ga. 1987), it was similarly held that a defendant in a Federal civil rights case was preempted from asserting a State Court claim for abusive litigation, the exclusive remedy being provided for by the Federal civil rights laws and Federal Rule 11.

9. This Court finds persuasive the direct analogy that, since Congress has vested exclusive jurisdiction over the Sherman Anti-Trust Act in the Federal Courts by specific statute, State Courts are preempted from determination of issues involving abuse of process or malicious prosecution arising out of Sherman Act litigation.

10. In such areas of preemptive jurisdiction, the rights of a party allegedly subjected to abusive, baseless, malicious or improper claims are to be determined by the remedies provided under Federal Rule 11, without the potentially conflicting interpretation of Federal law and procedure in a State Court. *Edmonds*, supra; *Gonzales*,

supra; *East-Bibb Twiggs*, supra. See also *Szabo Food Services, Inc. v. Canteen Corporation*, 823 F.2d 1073 (7th Cir., 1987).

11. The case of *Business Guides, Inc., v. Chromatic Communications Enterprises, Inc.*, 498 U.S. 533 (1991), is clearly distinguishable and is not persuasive or controlling in the present instance. The claims of abusive litigation involved in *Business Guides* arise under general civil litigation rather than out of some specifically preempted area of Federal law. Further, the scenario in *Business Guides* did not involve any attempt to assert claims in a State Court. The case of *Lightning Lube, Inc. v. Witco Corp.*, 4 F.3d 1153 (3rd Cir. 1993), is similarly distinguishable and unpersuasive.

12. The case of *Cohen v. Lupo*, 927 F.2d 363 (8th Cir., 1991) did involve State Court claims arising out of Federal litigation; however, the allegedly abusive Federal action arose out of general civil litigation and was not premised upon a specifically preemptive Federal statute. Again, the general principles cited therein are distinguishable and are not controlling herein.

13. The Court further notes parenthetically that even if abusive litigation claims arising out of Sherman Act litigation were determined to fall within the concurrent subject matter jurisdiction of the State Courts, the determination of the other threshold issues raised by the Defendants herein with regard to Statute of Limitations and personal jurisdiction over some of the parties would require resolution of complex issues arising out of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure relating to class action litigation; relating the effect of amendments to pleadings;

and relating to the effects of consolidation of cases. Such determinations would certainly present a potential conflict in the interpretation of specific Federal procedural rules by a State Court of an area clearly within the exclusive province of the Federal Courts.

14. It is the conclusion of the Court, therefore, that the subject matter of the Plaintiff's claims herein is preempted by operation of Federal law and procedure, and states no claim cognizable by a State Court.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Plaintiff's Petition and each cause of action therein claimed, should be and hereby is dismissed as against all named Defendants.

Entered in Chambers on this 18th day of December, 1997.

/s/ Daniel L. Hebert
DANIEL L. HEBERT,
DISTRICT JUDGE

Original filed with Clerk of the District Court

Copies were mailed, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule No. 134, to each of the following parties on this 18th day of December, 1997:

Thomas M. Bradshaw, Attorney
2345 Grand Blvd., Suite 2000
Kansas City, MO 64108

J. Stan Sexton, Attorney
PO Box 1247
Salina, KS 67402-1247

Arlen L. Tanner, Attorney
PO Box 12290
Overland Park, KS 66282

Norman Kelly, Attorney
PO Box 2388
Salina, KS 67402-2388

Richard T. Foster, Attorney
300 West Douglas, Suite 500
Wichita, KS 67202

Wayne Stratton, Attorney
515 South Kansas Avenue
Topeka, KS 66603-3999

James Griffin, Attorney
2300 Main Street, Suite 1100
Kansas City, MO 64106